

AD-A210 160

PERS-TR-88-006

PERSEREC

**MORAL WAIVERS AS PREDICTORS OF
UNSUITABILITY ATTRITION IN THE MILITARY**

DTIC
S ELECTE **D**
JUL 17 1989
D CP

Christopher C. Fitz
BDM Corporation

Michael A. McDaniel
Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center

December 1988

Approved for Public Distribution: Distribution Unlimited

**DEFENSE
PERSONNEL SECURITY
RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER**
99 Pacific Street, Building 455-E
Monterey, California 93940-2481

89 7 17 165

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) PERS-TR-88-006			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION PERSEREC (Defense Personnel Security Research & Education Center)		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel)	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 99 Pacific St., Bldg. 455-E Monterey, CA 93940				7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) The Pentagon Room 2B371 Washington, DC 20301	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of the Asst. Secretary of Defense (FM&P)		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) OASD (FM&P)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) The Pentagon Room 2B371 Washington, DC 20301		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.		PROJECT NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Moral Waivers as Predictors of Unsuitability Attrition in the Military					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Christopher C. Fitz and Michael A. McDaniel					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical Report		13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1988 December	
15. PAGE COUNT					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Personnel security; Prescreening; Predicting unsuitability; Moral waivers		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This study evaluates the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition for FY-82 military accessions. The results present evidence that accessions who require moral waivers for service entry are more likely than others to receive unsuitability discharges. These results support current Air Force policy, which disqualifies prospective recruits with moral waivers from sensitive job assignments. Additional research is needed to examine the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition for recruits in sensitive jobs. <i>PERSEREC (Defense Personnel Security Research & Education Center)</i>					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/INLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Carson K. Eoyang			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 408 646-2448		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

DECEMBER 1988

**MORAL WAIVERS AS PREDICTORS OF
UNSUITABILITY ATTRITION IN THE MILITARY**

Prepared by

Christopher C. Fitz
BDM Corporation

Michael A. McDaniel, Ph.D
Defense Personnel Security
Research and Education Center



Released by
Carson K. Eoyang, Ph.D
Director

Accession For	
NTIS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CRA&I	<input type="checkbox"/>
DTIC	<input type="checkbox"/>
TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center
Monterey, California 93940-2481

Preface

The improvement of screening procedures for military enlistees who will have access to classified information is a primary task in PERSEREC's mission. The relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition in the military is an important consideration for the development and improvement of personnel screening procedures. This technical report examines the relationship of waiver status and unsuitability for a broad range of military enlistees, and provides background for future research focusing on enlistees in sensitive job assignments.

Carson K. Eoyang
Director

MORAL WAIVERS AS PREDICTORS OF UNSUITABILITY ATTRITION IN THE MILITARY

Prepared by
Christopher C. Fitz and Michael A. McDaniel

Summary

Problem and Background

Previous studies analyzing the relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability attrition in the military have been inconclusive (Lang & Abrahams, 1985) or have drawn conclusions inconsistent with their results (Means, 1983). A clarification of this research area was needed to guide policy on eligibility for sensitive jobs.

Objective

The objective of the present study was to evaluate the relationship between moral waivers and behavioral reliability. Behavioral reliability was operationally defined using military attrition status. Those accessions who received unsuitability discharges from the services were judged as less reliable than those who did not.

Approach

Data were obtained from the population of fiscal year 1982 military accessions. The relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability discharge was examined for each military service. Potential moderators (AFQT, race, sex, and education) of the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability discharge were evaluated.

Results

The results of this research present evidence that, except in the case of Marine Corps traffic waivers, recruits who require moral waivers for service entry are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges. For all services, recruits with misdemeanor waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges. Almost all waivers granted to Army and Air Force accessions are for misdemeanors, and are the most frequently given waiver in the Navy.

In the Navy, recruits who receive drug waivers and "other" waivers (i.e., juvenile or adult felonies and preservice alcohol abuse) are more likely to receive an unsuitability discharge. In the Marine Corps traffic waivers are the most frequently given waiver; however, such waivers are unrelated to unsuitability discharge.

It was found that the accession groups more likely to receive moral waivers are: men, whites, those in higher AFQT groups, and non-high-school graduates.

Mental ability moderates the relationship between misdemeanor waivers and unsuitability discharge for both Army and Navy accessions. The difference in percent of unsuitability discharges between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without is greatest for recruits in lower mental categories. In the Navy, this trend is also apparent in the drug and "other" waiver analyses.

For both Army and Navy accessions, the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge is greater for blacks than for whites. In the Navy, this trend is also apparent in the drug and "other" waiver analyses. For Army accessions, the difference in percent of unsuitability discharges between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without is larger for males than for females.

For accessions from all services, educational level moderated the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge. The difference in percent of unsuitability discharges between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without is greater for high school graduates than for non-high school graduates.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Except for Marine Corps traffic waivers, accessions who require moral waivers for entrance to the military service are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those who do not. The predictive strength of moral waiver status, represented by a difference of approximately 6% in rates of unsuitability attrition, is robust enough to warrant serious consideration as a screening tool for each of the military branches. Additional research, such as that provided by Wiskoff and Dunipace (in press), is needed to examine the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition for recruits in sensitive jobs.

The results of this study support the current Air Force policy, which disqualifies from sensitive job assignments prospective recruits with moral waivers. However, as noted in Wiskoff and Dunipace (in press), the Air Force occasionally disregards policy and assigns recruits with moral waivers to sensitive occupations. Given the results obtained in the present research and in the Wiskoff and Dunipace report (in press), the Air Force may wish to adhere more closely to its own policy. Moreover, the other

services may contemplate following the lead of the Air Force and limiting the number of accessions with moral waivers who are assigned to sensitive positions.

In addition, the Marine Corps should reevaluate its standards for granting traffic waivers since its recruits with traffic waivers are not more likely than others to be unsuitably discharged.

Table of Contents

Preface	i
Summary	ii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Problem	1
Purpose	1
Moral Waiver Policy	2
Means Report	3
Lang & Abrahams	6
Procedure	11
Population	11
Predictor - Moral Waiver Status	11
Analyses	11
Criterion - Unsuitability	12
Results	13
Army	15
Navy	24
Air Force	36
Marine Corps	47
Conclusion	59
Recommendations	61
References	63

List of Tables

1.	Average Percentage 0-36 Month Adverse Attrition for Non-prior Service Male Accessions, FY 1979-79, by Moral Waiver Category, Education, and Service	5
2.	Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers	8
3.	First-year Unsuitability Attrition Rates for Marine Corps Accessions	9
4.	First-year Unsuitability Attrition Rates and Type of Waiver for Marine Corps Accessions	9
5.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions with Moral Waivers by Waiver Type	14
6.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	14
7.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions	15
8.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	15
9.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type	16
10.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	16
11.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions	17
12.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	17
13.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type	19
14.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	19

15.	The Relationship between Gender and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions	20
16.	The Relationship between Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	20
17.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type	21
18.	Percent Unsuitability Discharges by Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	21
19.	The Relationship Between Educational Level and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions	22
20.	The Relationship Between Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	22
21.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type	23
22.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions	23
23.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions with Moral Waivers by Waiver Type	25
24.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	25
25.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	26
26.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	26
27.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type	27
28.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	27

29.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	29
30.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	29
31.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type	30
32.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	30
33.	The Relationship Between Gender and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	31
34.	The Relationship Between Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	31
35.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type	32
36.	Percent Unsuitability Discharges by Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	32
37.	The Relationship between Educational Level and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	33
38.	The Relationship between Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	33
39.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type	34
40.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions	34
41.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type	37
42.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	37

43.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	38
44.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	38
45.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type	39
46.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	39
47.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	40
48.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	40
49.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type	41
50.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	41
51.	The Relationship between Gender and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	43
52.	The Relationship between Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	43
53.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type	44
54.	Percent Unsuitability Discharges by Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	44
55.	The Relationship Between Educational Level and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	45
56.	The Relationship Between Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	45

57.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type	46
58.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions	46
59.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type	48
60.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	48
61.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	50
62.	The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	50
63.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type	51
64.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	51
65.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	52
66.	The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	52
67.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type	53
68.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions ..	53
69.	The Relationship between Gender and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	54
70.	The Relationship between Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	54

71.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type	55
72.	Percent Unsuitability Discharges by Gender and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	55
73.	The Relationship between Educational Level and Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	56
74.	The Relationship between Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	56
75.	Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type	58
76.	Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions	58

Introduction

Problem

The suitability of military personnel for sensitive job assignments is an important security issue. As Flyer (1986) and McDaniel (1988) noted, persons who are discharged from military service for unsuitability are a potential security threat, particularly if they have held security clearances. Those who have received an unsuitability discharge are likely to hold a negative attitude towards the military and may also have financial problems stemming from their loss of military pay. Financial problems and a negative attitude, coupled with knowledge of classified information, may make such persons potential targets of hostile intelligence forces.

The moral waiver policy for military accessions is usually judged in the context of manpower demands and as part of larger accessions policy. If there is a relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability discharges, however, the waiver policy must also be evaluated from a security perspective.

One problem is that previous studies analyzing the relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability attrition have been either inconclusive (Lang & Abrahams, 1985) or have drawn conclusions inconsistent with their results (Means, 1983).

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to reexamine the relationship between waivers and unsuitability while avoiding the shortcomings of previous studies. If moral waiver status is found to predict unsuitability, then the military may want to consider moral waiver status in deciding whether to assign personnel to sensitive positions. Current Air Force policy considers moral waiver status in deciding the eligibility of prospective recruits for sensitive job assignments. Air Training Command Regulation 33-2 and Air Force Regulation 33-3 stipulate that prospective recruits with moral waivers are not eligible for sensitive job assignments. (However, Wiskoff and Dunipace, in press, found enlisted personnel with moral waivers in sensitive Air Force jobs.)

The other services do not deny access to sensitive jobs to recruits with moral waivers. However, each of the services has its own prescreening process which examines many of the same personnel background data covered by moral waivers (Crawford & Wiskoff, 1989).¹

¹ Recruiting in the Navy for sensitive jobs is governed by The Naval Recruiting Manual; in the Army it is governed by Army Recruiting Command Regulation 601-210 and Army Regulation 611-201; and in the Marine Corps by Marine Corps Order 1130.53K.

The moral waiver policy has security implications not only because waiver status can improve prediction of unsuitability, but also because waiver status reflects behavior that is subject to investigation by such national security clearance authorities as the Defense Investigative Service (DIS). These agencies are very interested in the criminal records and histories of substance abuse among personnel being investigated for clearances (Department of Defense, 1987). In cases where potential derogatory information concerning criminal activity or substance abuse is uncovered during the normal background investigation procedure, an expanded investigation is often conducted in the problem area. These expanded investigations, known as "issue cases" (Crawford & Trent, 1987), often focus on the same behaviors (criminal and substance abuse) which require moral waivers.²

Moral Waiver Policy

Each branch of the military sets moral standards for enlistment. These standards deal primarily with criminal offenses and substance abuse. Some patterns of past behavior render an individual ineligible for enlistment under any circumstances; other patterns, deemed less serious, do not necessarily eliminate applicants. If applicants meet criteria making them of special interest for recruitment, but have histories of some suspect behavior, individual reviews may be initiated for granting moral waivers.

There are eight categories of criminal offenses and substance abuse for which moral waivers may be given (Defense Manpower Data Center, 1982):

- 1) minor traffic offenses
- 2) 1 or 2 minor nontraffic offenses
- 3) 3 or more minor nontraffic offenses
- 4) nonminor misdemeanors
- 5) juvenile felonies
- 6) adult felonies
- 7) preservice drug abuse
- 8) preservice alcohol abuse.

Although moral waiver data for all services are categorized into these eight types by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), the offenses for which each type of waiver is given vary from one branch to another. The best example of this is in the traffic offense category. A person with a record of six convictions for minor traffic offenses over a period of a year or more is required by the Marine Corps to have a

²Flyer (1985) found that 'issue case' enlistees were much more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than 'non-issue case' enlistees.

waiver; the Navy would require the same person to have a waiver if four or more convictions occurred in a single year; and the Army and Air Force would allow him entry without any waiver at all (Means, 1983).

The services also differ in their classification of an offense as a felony or a misdemeanor:

The Marine Corps uses the maximum penalty possible for the given offense (as the basis for classification); the Navy uses the classification of the offense (i.e., felony or misdemeanor) used by the state in which it was committed; and the Army and Air Force use a set of guide lists of typical offenses of each type, which was developed by a 1966 Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) study group.

Means (1983) Report

Means (1983) addressed the relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability attrition. Means described the current policy for defining moral standards and granting moral waivers as serving a dual function: selecting personnel on the basis of (1) acceptable moral character and (2) minimizing attrition. She argued that there is a fundamental problem with insisting upon a single process to address two distinct issues.

Means suggested that two separate mechanisms would be more effective. She recommended that a minimum moral character standard be set, dealing only with serious offense histories or other unacceptable behavior and that a second mechanism, without the value-laden label of "moral standards," be developed which would involve a comprehensive evaluation of an individual's likelihood of meeting behavioral and performance standards during service.

This second determination would consider the frequency of minor law offenses within the framework of the current moral standard/waiver policy, as well as education level, test scores and other background information with proven predictive value. Applicants would go through two distinct screening processes. Uniform standards would be set for each process and the need for special waivers would be eliminated.

Waiver status and attrition. In her presentation of analyses, Means (1983) focused primarily on the relationship between moral waiver status and attrition as a whole, including attrition due to medical disqualifications, entry into officer commissioning programs, discharges for erroneous enlistment (or induction), etc., as well as attrition due to unsuitability. She concluded that accessions with moral waivers are only

slightly more likely than those without waivers to be separated early from service (Means, 1983, p. 28).

This conclusion is based on two sets of comparisons. The first is a comparison of percentages for accessions separated from service before completing a full 3 years. There is a 2% difference in attrition rates. Moral waiver accessions have a 30% attrition rate, and nonwaiver accessions have a 28% attrition rate.

The second comparison examines the moral waiver variable along with education and race relative to the number of months served (from 0 to 36 with terms exceeding 36 months coded as 36). This comparison is made for males entering a first term of service in each of the four time periods between FY-77 and FY-79. Means cited the following results from this comparison:

Even with the statistical power afforded by extremely large sample sizes, the moral waiver variable attained significance in only 2 of the 12 ANOVAs. (Education level was significant in all analyses and race in 8 analyses.) Moral waiver accessions served approximately 1.5 months less than nonwaiver accessions in the Army's FY 1977 ($F=7.65$) and FY 1978 ($F=9.13$) cohorts. The percentage of variance accounted for by moral waiver status in these analyses is paltry (less than 1 percent in all cases) (Means, 1983, p. 29).

Since there is no reason to suppose that waiver status should predict attrition due to medical disqualifications, entry into officer commissioning programs, or other separation categories other than unsuitability, it is not surprising that the data on attrition as a whole show little or no relationship to moral waiver status. However, it is reasonable to hypothesize that accessions with moral waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than accessions without waivers, because accessions with waivers have demonstrated questionable preservice behavior. Thus, the data in the Means report most relevant to the topic of this paper are those which address the relationship between waiver status and unsuitability attrition.

Waiver status and unsuitability. Means maintained that, "overall, accessions with moral waivers are not much more likely than nonwaiver accessions to be separated from service for failure to meet behavioral or performance standards" (Means, 1983, p. 40). The data which Means provided, however, did not support this conclusion (Table 20 from the Means report has been reproduced here and re-labelled as Table 1). Table 1 shows average male adverse attrition (i.e., unsuitability attrition) for each type of moral waiver over a 3 year period by education level.

Table 1

Average Percentage 0-36 Month Adverse Attrition for Non-Prior Service
Male Accessions, FY 57-73, by Moral Waiver Category, Education, and Service

(adapted from "Moral Standards for Military Enlistment: Screening Procedures and Impact", Means, 1983)

MORAL WAIVER CATEGORY	ARMY			NAVY			AIR FORCE			MARINE CORPS		
	NHS	GED	HSG	NHS	GED	HSG	NHS	GED	HSG	NHS	GED	HSG
None	37.64 (128,884) ^b	35.77 (13,652)	18.84 (238,780)	33.19 (46,789)	30.19 (9,518)	14.54 (157,128)	36.27 (10,506)	37.82 (5,981)	17.22 (156,311)	31.29 (23,238)	33.38 (1,774)	14.68 (59,653)
Traffic	42.78 (339)	31.25 (84)	23.48 ^a (473)	37.32 ^a (828)	30.69 (502)	16.88 ^a (3,557)	-	41.08 (58)	22.29 ^a (8,497)	28.52 ^a (7,279)	29.57 (739)	15.07 (21,058)
1-2 Minor	44.44 ^a (637)	42.48 (113)	23.86 ^a (742)	36.75 ^a (508)	41.19 ^a (153)	20.87 ^a (1,074)	37.06 (112)	43.91 (123)	27.13 ^a (778)	34.81 ^a (1,141)	40.92 ^a (198)	19.95 ^a (2,423)
3 or More Minor	44.84 ^a (419)	37.26 (87)	21.92 ^a (470)	41.80 ^a (201)	28.79 (66)	22.23 ^a (444)	-	-	21.23 (608)	38.01 (150)	-	20.47 ^a (347)
Nonminor Mis- deemeanors	41.45 ^a (8,033)	42.36 ^a (1,509)	23.39 ^a (10,844)	38.95 ^a (4,086)	35.04 ^a (1,436)	20.12 ^a (9,369)	41.95 ^a (546)	40.21 ^a (709)	21.50 ^a (4,793)	34.35 ^a (1,232)	39.10 (307)	17.05 (3,082)
Adult Felony	35.86 (53)	-	13.45 (80)	38.34 (54)	24.07 (308)	19.30 ^a (52)	-	52.00 (344)	18.82 (127)	-	-	21.34
Juvenile Felony	34.36 (192)	35.81 (81)	19.87 (438)	38.94 (547)	37.74 ^a (212)	27.03 ^a (990)	43.86 (71)	46.82 (118)	24.35 ^a (378)	-	-	25.32 ^a
Drug	-	-	28.73 (59)	33.29 (4,741)	31.75 (1,547)	16.02 ^a (16,659)	41.76 ^a (143)	39.67 (194)	22.35 ^a (1,213)	32.09 (983)	28.80 (150)	17.80 ^a (2,584)
Alcohol	43.43 ^a (714)	35.14 (111)	19.29 ^a (1,525)	35.03 (1,779)	34.10 (573)	16.52 ^a (5,453)	47.18 (53)	30.78 (52)	19.78 (488)	34.47 (288)	38.77 (88)	17.99 ^a (1,145)
TOTAL	37.75	36.42	17.16	33.85	31.23	15.14	38.81	38.73	18.48	32.68	33.18	14.94

Source: Defense Manpower Data Center, special analyses.

^aDashes appear in cells with fewer than 50 cases.

^bNumber of cases appears in parentheses.

Figures differing from corresponding adverse attrition rate for nonwaiver accessions with $p < .05$ have an asterisk (*).

Means said that "adverse attrition rates for moral waiver accessions are similar to those of nonwaiver accessions drawn from the same education group" (Means, 1983, p. 38). This statement was not supported by her analyses. A more accurate conclusion from Table 1 is that accessions with moral waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than nonwaiver accessions of the same educational level. Table 1 shows 84 cells in which average percentages are given for adverse attrition for accessions with waivers. Forty-two of these cells show a statistically significant ($p < .05$) difference when compared to nonwaiver accessions of the same education level (these cells are marked with an asterisk).

All but one of the 42 cells with statistically significant differences show rates of attrition which are higher for accessions with waivers than those without. (The anomaly of non-high school graduates with traffic waivers in the Marine Corps is discussed later in this paper.) In the remaining 42 cells where statistically significant differences were not obtained, 33 show higher percentages of adverse attrition for waiver accessions, while only 9 show higher percentages for nonwaiver accessions. There is, therefore, a clear trend of higher rates of attrition for waiver accessions than for nonwaiver accessions. The preponderance of evidence in Table 1 clearly shows that accessions with moral waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than nonwaiver accessions.

Although all moral waiver categories show statistically significant differences in at least one of the 12 service/education groupings, some of the moral waiver categories show statistical significance in more of the service/education groupings than other moral waiver categories. Statistical significance is a function of both effect size and sample size. The three misdemeanor waiver categories show the greatest number of statistically significant findings due to adequate sample sizes and sufficiently large effect sizes.

Lang & Abrahams

Another report (Lang & Abrahams, 1985) made reference to the relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability attrition, although it did not address this subject specifically. This report examined an increase in the granting of moral waivers for the Marine Corps over a 6 year period, and focused on whether this increase had an effect on unsuitability attrition. Lang and Abrahams did not report any conclusions about the relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability attrition as a whole. However, they did conclude that the increase in moral waivers over this 6 year period did not affect rates of unsuitability attrition in the Marine Corps. Although Lang and Abrahams drew no conclusions about the relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability in this report, one might infer from their data (Tables 4, 5, and 6 from the Lang and Abrahams report have been reproduced and re-labelled for this report as Tables 2, 3 and 4, respectively) that moral waiver status is not a predictor of unsuitability since accessions

with waivers have the same rates of unsuitability attrition as those without waivers (see Table 3). This conclusion is problematic for two reasons.

As was the case in the Means report, the data on the relationship of waiver status and unsuitability in the Marine Corps are skewed by the Marines' inordinate number of traffic waivers (see Table 2). When the traffic waivers are removed from the analysis, the remaining waivers consistently predict unsuitability. Table 4 shows unsuitability attrition for five waiver groups for the years from 1978 to 1982. Accessions with "minor violations," "misdemeanor," and "felony" waivers have higher rates of unsuitability attrition than those without waivers for each of the 5 years. Accessions with "drug or alcohol abuse" waivers have higher attrition rates for 4 of the 5 years. Because rates of unsuitability attrition for traffic waivers are lower than or equivalent to attrition rates for nonwaivers, and because traffic waivers make up the vast majority of waivers as a whole, the relationship between waiver status and unsuitability is masked.

The second problem is that the Lang and Abrahams data reflected only "first year" unsuitability attrition. It is reasonable to assume that this may cause some underestimation in the relationship between waiver status and unsuitability since it takes military services longer than one year to identify and process out of service all accessions who are unsuitable.

Table 2**Marine Corps Accessions with Moral Waivers**

(adapted from "Marine Corps Enlistment Standards:
Trends and Impact of Waivers," Lang and Abrahams, 1985)

Moral Waivers	Percentage by Fiscal Year					
	78	79	80	81	82	83
Minor traffic violation	24	29	36	40	39	39
Other minor violation	3	3	4	4	5	6
Misdemeanor	4	3	5	5	5	5
Felony	-	-	1	1	1	1
Preservice drug or alcohol abuse	5	6	1	-	1	6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: A dash represents less than 1 percent.

Table 3

**First-year Unsuitability Attrition
Rates for Marine Corps Accessions**

(adapted from "Marine Corps Enlistment Standards:
Trends and Impact of Waivers," Lang and Abrahams, 1985)

	Percentage by Fiscal Year				
	78	79	80	81	82
Waiver	14	13	13	16	17
No waiver	14	13	13	15	16

Table 4

**First-year Unsuitability Attrition
Rates and Type of Waiver for Marine Corps Accessions**

(adapted from "Marine Corps Enlistment Standards:
Trends and Impact of Waivers," Lang and Abrahams, 1985)

Moral Waivers	Percentage by Fiscal Year				
	78	79	80	81	82
Minor traffic violation	12	12	12	15	17
Other minor violation	18	15	15	18	20
Misdemeanor	17	15	14	17	19
Felony	20	14	15	19	22
Preservice drug or alcohol abuse	13	14	15	19	18

Procedure

Population

The population included all fiscal year 1982 military accessions excluding cases deleted due to missing or obviously erroneous data for the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT), sex, age, education level, and race/ethnic group. In addition, only those listing their race/ethnic group as white, black, Hispanic or Asian were considered, because of the small frequencies involved with other categories. The population included 112,737 Army, 73,567 Navy, 63,805 Air Force, and 33,120 Marine Corps accessions.

Predictor - Moral Waiver Status

Since the behavior for which each type of waiver may be given varies across services (Means, 1983), moral waivers were analyzed for each of the four branches of service individually. The categories analyzed for the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps were "misdemeanor," "traffic," and "other," which included all waivers not falling into the first two categories. The categories analyzed for the Navy were "misdemeanor," "traffic," "drug," and "other." Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) moral waiver categories 2, 3, and 4 were collapsed into a single "misdemeanor" category³ for all services; "other" included categories 5, 6, 7, and 8 for the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps and categories 5, 6, and 8 for the Navy. (See page 3 for a listing of the moral waiver codes as maintained by the Defense Manpower Data Center.)

Analyses

The analyses presented in this paper include, for each service, the percentage and frequencies of accessions by waiver category, and the percent of unsuitability discharges by each category. The relationship between moral waivers and unsuitability attrition may be dependent on the values of other variables. Therefore, the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition is also examined by controlling

³Categories 2 and 3 refer to 'minor non-traffic offenses.' This label loosely refers to offenses categorized in different states as 'minor misdemeanors' or 'petty criminal offenses.' Category 4 refers to 'non-minor misdemeanors.' The distinction between 'minor misdemeanors' (or petty criminal offenses) and 'non-minor misdemeanors' varies among the services. Categories 2, 3, and 4 form a homogeneous group of non-traffic, non-felonious offenses, which is best described by the term "misdemeanor."

for four variables (potential moderators) that have a joint influence on both waiver status and unsuitability attrition. The four potential moderators analyzed are AFQT mental categories, race/ethnic group, gender, and education level (high school graduates versus non-high school graduates).

Criterion - Unsuitability

Unsuitability attrition is operationally defined as those accessions having inter-service separation codes 60 through 87, for failure to meet minimum behavioral or performance standards. Attrition due to medical disqualifications, entry into officer commissioning programs, discharges for erroneous enlistment, etc., was not included. The unsuitability discharge group consisted of those personnel who received an unsuitability discharge on or before 30 September 1986.

Results

Army

Table 5 shows the percentages and frequencies of fiscal year 1982 Army accessions with moral waivers by waiver type. The "other" category type includes waivers for juvenile or adult felonies and preservice drug or alcohol abuse. Although we collapsed several low-frequency waiver categories into an "other" waiver category, the number of "other" waivers is small (60). Likewise, the number of traffic waivers is small (314). In contrast, there were 7,936 misdemeanor waivers. Although the tables displaying the Army data include the results for misdemeanor, traffic, and "other" waivers, the discussion will focus solely on the comparisons between those who received and those who did not receive a misdemeanor waiver. Table 6 shows that those enlistees in the Army with misdemeanor waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those without. There is a difference of 6.4% between the two groups in the likelihood of receiving an unsuitability discharge.

AFQT. AFQT scores measuring mental ability are divided into six categories (I, II, IIIA, IIIB, IVA, and IVB) with category I having the highest scores and IVB having the lowest. Table 7 shows the relationship between the AFQT category and unsuitability discharge. Table 8 presents the relationship between AFQT category and moral waiver status. Note that those in higher mental categories are less likely to receive unsuitability discharges but more likely to receive a misdemeanor waiver. Table 9 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by AFQT category and moral waiver type. Table 10 shows the percent of unsuitability discharges by AFQT category and moral waiver status.

The results indicate that the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition is not a spurious one caused by the correlation of AFQT with the waiver and attrition variables. Misdemeanor waiver status is a predictor of unsuitability attrition in all AFQT categories. However, AFQT group appears to moderate the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge. Specifically, the difference in unsuitability discharge percents between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without such waivers is smaller in higher mental ability groups and larger in lower mental ability groups.

Race/Ethnic Group. Whites received a greater proportion of unsuitability discharges than blacks, Hispanics, or Asians (see Table 11). Whites were also granted a greater proportion of misdemeanor waivers (see Table 12). The question arises as to whether misdemeanor waiver status is an accurate predictor of unsuitability, or whether the apparent relationship is an artifact arising from the relationship between race, waiver and attrition status.

Table 5

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Waiver Type**

Waiver Type	Percent	Frequency
Misdemeanor	7.1	7,996
Traffic	0.3	314
"Other"	0.1	60
Any moral waiver	7.4	8,370
No moral waiver	92.6	104,367
Total	100.0	112,737

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 6

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status
for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

Waiver Type	Percent
Misdemeanor	32.3
No misdemeanor	25.9
Difference	6.4
Traffic	27.1
No traffic	26.4
Difference	0.7
"Other"	28.3
No "other"	26.4
Difference	1.9
Any Moral Waiver	32.1
No Moral Waiver	25.9
Difference	6.2

Table 7

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	25.7	25.7	29.7	28.8	23.1	15.5	26.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	1,901	3,622	9,206	6,828	7,639	532	29,728
Frequency of Total Accessions	7,395	14,117	30,994	23,716	33,089	3,426	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	6.6	12.5	27.5	21.0	29.4	3.0	100.0

Table 8

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Percent of Moral Waivers	4.6	5.2	7.0	8.4	8.6	9.2	7.4
Frequency of Moral Waivers	340	736	2,158	1,990	2,834	314	8,370
Frequency of Total Accessions	7,395	14,117	30,994	23,716	33,089	3,426	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	6.6	12.5	27.5	21.0	29.4	3.0	100.0

Table 9

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions
with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type

AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups														
	IV B		IV A		III B		III A		II		I		Total	
Waiver Type	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	4.4	323	5.0	710	6.7	2,084	8.1	1,909	8.1	2,672	8.7	298	7.1	7,908
Traffic	0.2	17	0.2	23	0.2	60	0.3	64	0.4	137	0.4	13	0.3	314
'Other'	-	-	-	3	-	12	0.1	17	0.1	28	0.1	3	0.1	60
Any Moral Waiver	4.6	340	5.2	736	7.0	2,156	8.4	1,990	8.6	2,834	9.2	314	7.4	8,370
No Moral Waiver	95.4	7,055	94.8	13,381	93.0	28,838	91.6	21,726	91.4	30,256	90.8	3,112	92.6	104,367
Total	100.0	7,395	100.0	14,117	100.0	30,994	100.0	23,716	100.0	33,089	100.0	3,428	100.0	112,737
Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.														

Table 10

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Misdemeanor	35.0	35.2	35.5	34.9	28.5	17.1	32.3
No Misdemeanor	25.3	25.2	29.3	28.3	22.6	15.4	25.9
Difference	9.7	10.0	6.2	6.6	5.9	1.9	7.3
Traffic	29.4	26.1	40.0	25.0	23.4	15.4	27.1
No Traffic	25.7	25.7	29.7	28.8	23.1	15.5	26.4
Difference	3.7	0.4	10.3	-3.8	0.3	-0.1	0.7
'Other'	-	33.3	25.0	17.7	40.0	15.5	28.3
No 'Other'	25.7	25.7	29.7	28.8	23.1	-	26.4
Difference	7.6	-4.7	-11.1	16.9	15.5	-	1.9
Any Moral Waiver	34.7	34.9	35.5	34.5	28.4	16.9	32.1
No Moral Waiver	25.3	25.2	29.3	28.3	22.6	15.4	25.9
Difference	9.4	9.7	6.2	6.2	5.8	1.5	7.0

Table 11

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	28.2	22.6	20.2	16.9	26.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	22,245	6,365	937	181	29,728
Frequency of Total Accessions	78,870	28,150	4,644	1,073	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	70.0	25.0	4.1	0.9	100.0

Table 12

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	8.9	4.1	3.4	2.8	7.4
Frequency of Moral Waivers	7,022	1,160	158	30	8,370
Frequency of Total Accessions	78,870	28,150	4,644	1,073	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	70.0	25.0	4.1	0.9	100.0

Table 13 gives the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by race/ethnic group and waiver type. Table 14 shows that misdemeanor waiver status is a predictor of unsuitability within each racial group. The difference in unsuitability discharge percents between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without is not constant for each racial group. The difference in discharge percents for blacks (8.6) is larger than that for whites (4.8). The small number of waivers granted to Hispanics and Asians, however, precludes a meaningful interpretation of their results.

Gender Females show lower attrition than males (see Table 15), and also receive fewer waivers (see Table 16). This raises the question of whether the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition is really attributable to gender differences.

Table 17 lists the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by gender and waiver type. Table 18 indicates that the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition cannot be solely attributed to gender. Misdemeanor waiver status predicts unsuitability attrition for both sexes. However, gender does appear to moderate the waiver/unsuitability relationship. The difference in discharge percents for males (6.5) is more than three times the difference for females (2.0).

Education Enlistees who have not graduated from high school are separated from service with unsuitability discharges in much greater proportions than those who have completed a high school education (see Table 19). Non-high school graduates are also more likely than graduates to receive moral waivers (see Table 20). This analysis addresses the question of whether the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability is a spurious one caused by the correlation of education with the waiver and attrition measures.

Table 21 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by education level and waiver type. Table 22 shows that when the education variable is taken into consideration, individual differences in misdemeanor waiver status predict differences in unsuitability discharge. However, the effect is much stronger for high school graduates.

Summary Misdemeanor waivers account for almost all moral waivers granted to Army accessions. For Army accessions as a whole, those who received a misdemeanor waiver had a greater probability of unsuitability than those who did not. This relationship is evident across all mental categories, race/ethnic groups, sexes, and for both high school graduates and nongraduates. The relationship is strongest for those in lower mental categories, blacks, males, and high school graduates.

Table 13

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type**

<u>Waiver Type</u>	<u>White</u>		<u>Black</u>		<u>Hispanic</u>		<u>Asian</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
Misdemeanor	8.5	6,710	4.0	1,112	3.1	144	2.8	30	7.1	7,996
Traffic	0.3	267	0.1	36	0.2	11	--	--	0.3	314
"Other"	0.1	45	--	12	0.1	3	--	--	0.1	60
Any Waiver	8.9	7,022	4.1	1,160	3.4	158	2.8	30	7.4	8,370
No Waiver	91.1	71,848	95.9	26,990	96.6	4,486	97.2	1,043	92.6	104,367
TOTAL	100.0	78,870	100.0	28,150	100.0	4,644	100.0	1,073	100.0	112,737

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 14

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Misdemeanor	32.6	30.9	28.5	36.7	32.3
No Misdemeanor	27.8	22.3	19.9	16.3	25.9
Difference	4.8	8.6	8.6	20.4	6.4
Traffic	26.6	30.6	27.3	--	27.1
No Traffic	28.2	22.6	20.2	16.9	26.4
Difference	-1.6	8.0	7.1	--	0.7
"Other"	28.9	33.3	--	--	28.3
No "Other"	28.2	22.6	20.2	16.9	26.4
Difference	0.7	10.7	--	--	1.9
Any Moral Waiver	32.3	31.0	27.9	36.7	32.1
No Moral Waiver	27.3	22.3	19.9	16.3	25.9
Difference	5.0	8.7	8.0	20.4	6.2

Table 15

**The Relationship Between Gender and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	26.7	23.9	26.4
Frequency of Unsuitability Discharges	26,307	3,421	29,728
Frequency of Total Accessions	98,445	14,292	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	87.3	12.7	100.0

Table 16

**The Relationship Between Gender and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	8.1	3.1	7.4
Frequency of Moral Waivers	7,928	442	8,370
Frequency of Total Accessions	98,445	14,292	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	87.3	12.7	100.0

Table 17

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type**

<u>Waiver Type</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
Misdemeanor	7.7	7,564	3.0	432	7.1	7,996
Traffic	0.3	306	0.1	8	0.3	314
"Other"	0.1	58	--	2	0.1	60
Any moral waiver	8.1	7,928	3.1	442	7.4	8,370
No moral waiver	91.9	90,517	96.9	13,850	92.6	104,367
Total	100.0	98,445	100.0	14,292	100.0	112,737

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 18

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Gender and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Misdemeanor	32.7	25.9	32.0
No misdemeanor	26.2	23.9	25.0
Difference	6.5	2.0	6.4
Traffic	26.8	37.5	27.1
No traffic	26.7	23.9	23.4
Difference	0.1	13.6	0.7
"Other"	29.3	--	23.3
No "other"	26.7	23.9	26.4
Difference	2.6	--	1.9
Any Moral Waiver	32.4	26.0	32.1
No Moral Waiver	26.2	23.9	25.0
Difference	6.2	2.1	6.2

Table 19**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	23.3	46.5	26.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	22,698	7,030	29,728
Frequency of Total Accessions	97,615	15,122	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	86.6	13.4	100.0

Table 20**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	7.1	9.8	7.4
Frequency of Moral Waivers	6,889	1,481	8,370
Frequency of Total Accessions	97,615	15,122	112,737
Percent of Total Accessions	86.6	13.4	100.0

Table 21

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Army Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type**

<u>Waiver Type</u>	<u>High School Grads</u>		<u>Non-HS Grads</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
Misdemeanor	6.7	6,567	9.5	1,429	7.1	7,996
Traffic	0.3	265	0.3	49	0.3	314
"Other"	0.1	57	--	3	0.1	60
Any moral waiver	7.1	6,889	9.8	1,481	7.4	8,370
No moral waiver	92.9	90,726	90.2	13,641	92.6	104,367
Total	100.0	97,615	100.0	15,122	100.0	112,737

Table 22

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges
by Educational Level and Moral Waiver Status for
FY 1982 Army Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Misdemeanor	29.0	47.6	32.3
No misdemeanor	22.8	46.4	25.9
Difference	6.2	1.2	6.4
Traffic	24.5	40.8	27.1
No traffic	23.3	46.5	26.4
Difference	1.2	-5.7	0.7
"Other"	28.1	33.3	28.3
No "other"	23.3	46.5	26.4
Difference	4.8	-13.2	1.9
Any Moral Waiver	28.8	47.3	32.1
No Moral Waiver	22.8	46.4	25.9
Difference	6.0	0.9	6.2

Navy

Table 23 shows percentages and frequencies of fiscal year 1982 Navy accessions with moral waivers by waiver type. The "other" waiver type included waivers for juvenile or adult felonies and preservice alcohol abuse. Unlike the other services, the Navy grants a considerable number of preservice drug use waivers. Therefore, drug waivers were analyzed separately and were not combined in the "other" category as they were in the analyses for the other services. Given the small number of traffic waivers (194), the results are not discussed here although they are available in the tables. Table 24 demonstrates that enlistees in the Navy with moral waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those without moral waivers. There is a difference of 8.6% between the two groups in the likelihood of receiving an unsuitability discharge. When the waiver categories are examined individually, the "other" category and the misdemeanor categories show the largest differences in percent of discharge (10.0% and 9.8% respectively). Individual differences in drug waiver status is also related to individual differences in unsuitability discharge although the relationship is weaker (with a difference of 4.0%).

AFQT. Table 25 demonstrates the relationship between AFQT category and unsuitability discharge. Table 26 shows the relationship between AFQT category and moral waiver status. Table 27 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by AFQT category and moral waiver type. Table 28 gives the percent of unsuitability discharges by AFQT category and moral waiver status.

The results indicate that the relationship between moral waiver and unsuitability attrition is not solely dependent on the correlation of AFQT with the waiver and attrition variables. When the percentages of unsuitability discharges are examined by AFQT category, they continue to show that enlistees with waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than other accessions.

As was the case with the Army data, AFQT appears to have a moderating effect on the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability discharge. In general, as AFQT decreases, the difference in unsuitability discharge between those with waivers and those without waivers tends to increase. In the Navy data, an exception to this trend is found in AFQT group IV-A where the differences in unsuitability discharge rates by any moral waiver are lower than what one would expect from the trend in the data. When one examines the results for the individual waiver categories, the moderating effect is also evident although both the misdemeanor and drug waiver categories show some departure from this trend.

Table 23

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Waiver Type**

Waiver Type	Percent	Frequency
Misdemeanor	13.9	10,196
Drug	10.3	7,540
"Other"	1.3	916
Traffic	0.3	194
Any moral waiver	25.6	18,846
No moral waiver	74.4	54,721
Total	100.0	73,567

Table 24

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges
by Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

Waiver Type	Percent
Misdemeanor	31.5
No misdemeanor	21.7
Difference	9.8
Drug	26.7
No Drug	22.7
Difference	4.0
"Other"	33.0
No "other"	23.0
Difference	10.0
Traffic	18.6
No traffic	23.1
Difference	4.5
Any Moral Waiver	29.5
No Moral Waiver	20.9
Difference	8.6

Table 25

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						<u>Total</u>
	<u>IV B</u>	<u>IV A</u>	<u>III B</u>	<u>III A</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>I</u>	
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	24.3	23.1	27.7	24.6	19.7	13.7	23.1
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	481	1,227	5,431	4,105	5,358	374	16,976
Frequency of Total Accessions	1,980	5,311	19,625	16,714	27,201	2,736	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	2.7	7.2	26.7	22.7	37.0	3.7	100.0

Table 26

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						<u>Total</u>
	<u>IV B</u>	<u>IV A</u>	<u>III B</u>	<u>III A</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>I</u>	
Percent of Moral Waivers	13.2	16.0	24.2	26.5	28.5	30.3	25.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	262	850	4,744	4,423	7,739	828	18,846
Frequency of Total Accessions	1,980	5,311	19,625	16,714	27,201	2,736	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	2.7	7.2	26.7	22.7	37.0	3.7	100.0

Table 27

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions
with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type

Waiver Type	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups													
	IV B		IV A		III B		III A		II		I		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	8.9	137	8.5	453	13.6	2,666	14.6	2,481	15.0	4,068	14.3	391	13.9	10,198
Drug	5.2	114	6.8	360	9.3	1,828	9.9	1,651	11.7	3,190	14.5	387	10.3	7,540
*Other	0.6	11	0.6	32	1.1	215	1.6	260	1.4	373	0.9	25	1.1	916
Traffic	-	-	0.1	5	0.2	35	0.2	31	0.4	108	0.6	15	0.3	194
Any Moral Waiver	13.2	262	16.0	830	24.2	4,744	26.7	4,423	26.5	7,739	30.3	828	25.6	18,846
No Moral Waiver	86.8	1,718	84.0	4,461	75.8	19,881	73.5	12,291	71.5	19,462	69.7	1,908	74.4	54,721
Total	100.0	1,980	100.0	5,311	100.0	19,625	100.0	16,714	100.0	27,201	100.0	2,736	100.0	73,567

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 28

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Misdemeanor	33.6	28.9	38.9	32.6	27.3	21.0	31.5
No Misdemeanor	23.6	22.6	25.9	23.2	18.4	12.5	21.7
Difference	10.0	6.3	13.0	9.4	8.9	8.5	10.5
Drug	32.5	25.0	31.8	30.0	23.7	14.1	26.7
No Drug	23.8	23.0	27.3	24.0	19.2	13.6	22.7
Difference	8.7	2.0	4.5	6.0	4.5	0.5	4.0
*Other	54.6	37.5	38.1	34.2	29.2	16.0	33.0
No *Other	24.1	23.1	27.6	24.4	19.6	13.7	23.0
Difference	30.5	14.4	10.5	9.8	9.6	2.3	10.0
Traffic	-	20.0	17.1	16.1	21.3	6.7	18.6
No Traffic	24.3	23.1	27.7	24.6	19.7	13.7	23.1
Difference	-	-3.1	-10.6	-8.5	1.6	-0.7	-4.5
Any Moral Waiver	34.0	27.5	35.9	31.6	25.9	17.3	29.5
No Moral Waiver	22.8	22.3	25.0	22.0	17.3	12.1	20.9
Difference	11.2	5.2	10.9	9.6	8.5	5.2	9.0

Race/Ethnic Group. Whites receive a greater proportion of unsuitability discharges than blacks, Hispanics, or Asians (see Table 29). Whites are also granted a greater proportion of moral waivers (see Table 30). The question arises as to whether moral waiver status is an accurate predictor of unsuitability, or whether the apparent relationship may be due to the correlations of race with waiver and attrition status.

Table 31 gives the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by race/ethnic group and waiver type. Table 32 demonstrates that moral waiver status is a predictor of unsuitability within each racial group. As was the case with the Army data, the difference in percent discharges between those with a waiver and those without is larger for blacks than whites. The small number of waivers granted to Hispanics and Asians limits the interpretability of their data.

Gender. Females show lower attrition than males (see Table 33), and also receive fewer waivers (see Table 34). This raises the question of whether the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition is really due to gender differences.

Table 35 gives the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by gender and waiver type. Table 36 demonstrates that the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition is not due to gender. Moral waiver status predicts unsuitability attrition for both sexes. In contrast to the Army data, gender does not meaningfully moderate the difference in percent discharges between those with a waiver and those without.

Education. Enlistees who have not graduated from high school are separated from service with unsuitability discharges in much greater proportions than those who have completed a high school education (see Table 37). Non-high school graduates are more likely than graduates to receive moral waivers (see Table 38). This brings into question whether the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability is dependent on the correlation of education with the waiver and attrition measure.

Table 39 presents the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by education level and waiver type. Table 40 shows that when the education variable is considered, moral waiver status continues to be a predictor of unsuitability for graduates and nongraduates. When the different waiver categories are examined separately by education level, they continue to predict unsuitability. Although the effect is not as strong as in the Army data, high school graduation status appears to moderate weakly the difference in percent discharges between those with a waiver and those without. The moderating effect is weakest for the misdemeanor and drug waivers and strongest for the "others" waiver category. The difference in percentage of unsuitability discharge between those who receive waivers and those who do not is largest for high school graduates.

Table 29

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	23.3	23.0	21.6	9.1	23.1
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	14,048	2,316	550	82	16,976
Frequency of Total Accessions	60,248	10,089	2,545	685	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	81.9	13.7	3.5	0.9	100.0

Table 30

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	27.4	16.8	20.8	15.5	25.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	16,513	1,698	529	106	18,846
Frequency of Total Accessions	60,248	10,089	2,545	685	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	81.9	13.7	3.5	0.9	100.0

Table 31

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type

Waiver Type	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	15.1	9,105	7.6	770	10.8	274	6.9	47	13.9	10,196
Drug	10.7	8,419	8.3	836	9.1	231	7.9	54	10.3	7,540
"Other"	1.3	810	0.8	82	0.8	19	0.7	5	1.3	916
Traffic	0.3	179	0.1	10	0.2	5	--	--	0.3	194
Any Waiver	27.4	16,513	16.8	1,698	20.8	529	15.5	106	25.6	18,846
No Waiver	72.6	43,735	83.2	8,391	79.2	2,016	84.5	579	74.4	54,721
TOTAL	100.0	60,248	100.0	10,089	100.0	2,545	100.0	685	100.0	73,567

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 32

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Total
Misdemeanor	31.4	35.8	25.9	19.2	31.5
No Misdemeanor	21.9	21.9	21.1	8.3	21.7
Difference	9.5	13.9	4.8	10.9	9.8
Drug	26.8	27.9	24.2	11.1	26.7
No Drug	32.9	22.5	21.4	8.9	22.7
Difference	3.9	5.4	2.8	2.2	4.0
"Other"	31.5	47.6	42.1	--	33.0
No "Other"	23.2	22.8	21.5	9.1	23.0
Difference	8.3	24.8	20.6	--	10.0
Traffic	18.4	10.0	40.0	--	18.6
No Traffic	23.3	23.0	21.6	9.1	23.1
Difference	-4.9	-10.0	18.4	--	-4.5
Any Moral Waiver	29.5	32.3	25.9	14.2	29.5
No Moral Waiver	21.0	21.1	20.5	8.1	20.9
Difference	8.5	11.2	5.4	6.1	8.6

Table 33

**The Relationship Between Gender and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	24.3	12.6	23.1
Frequency of Unsuitability Discharges	16,024	952	16,976
Frequency of Total Accessions	66,017	7,550	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	89.7	10.3	100.0

Table 34

**The Relationship Between Gender and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	27.2	11.4	25.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	17,986	860	18,846
Frequency of Total Accessions	66,017	7,550	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	89.7	10.3	100.0

Table 35

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type**

<u>Waiver Type</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
Misdemeanor	14.9	9,848	4.6	348	13.9	10,196
Drug	10.7	7,055	6.4	485	10.3	7,540
"Other"	1.4	899	0.2	17	1.3	916
Traffic	0.3	184	0.1	10	0.3	194
Any moral waiver	27.2	17,986	11.4	860	25.6	18,846
No moral waiver	72.8	48,031	88.6	6,690	74.4	54,721
Total	100.0	66,017	100.0	7,550	100.0	73,567

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 36

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges
by Gender and Moral Waiver Status for
FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Misdemeanor	31.8	22.7	31.5
No misdemeanor	23.0	12.1	21.7
Difference	8.8	10.6	9.8
Drug	27.5	15.5	26.7
No Drug	23.9	12.4	22.7
Difference	3.6	3.1	4.0
"Other"	33.2	23.5	33.0
No "other"	24.2	12.6	23.0
Difference	9.0	10.0	10.0
Traffic	19.6	--	18.6
No traffic	24.3	12.6	23.1
Difference	4.7	--	4.5
Any Moral Waiver	30.1	18.4	29.5
No Moral Waiver	22.1	11.9	20.9
Difference	8.0	6.5	8.6

Table 37**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	17.9	41.7	23.1
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	10,339	6,637	16,976
Frequency of Total Accessions	57,632	15,935	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	78.3	21.7	100.0

Table 38**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	23.5	33.4	25.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	13,531	5,315	18,846
Frequency of Total Accessions	57,632	15,935	73,567
Percent of Total Accessions	78.3	21.7	100.0

Table 39

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Navy Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type

Waiver Type	High School		Non-HS		Total	
	Grads		Grads			
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	12.1	6,970	20.2	3,226	13.9	10,196
Drug	10.1	5,810	10.9	1,730	10.3	7,540
"Other"	1.0	592	2.0	324	1.3	916
Traffic	0.3	159	0.2	35	0.3	194
Any moral waiver	23.5	13,531	33.4	5,315	25.6	18,844
No moral waiver	76.5	44,101	66.7	10,620	74.4	54,721
Total	100.0	57,632	100.0	15,935	100.0	73,567

Table 40

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Navy Accessions

	High School	Non-HS	Total
	Grads	Grads	
Misdemeanor	24.7	46.2	31.5
No misdemeanor	17.0	40.5	21.7
Difference	7.7	5.7	9.8
Drug	21.6	43.8	26.7
No Drug	17.5	41.4	22.7
Difference	4.1	2.4	4.0
"Other"	26.9	44.1	33.0
No "other"	17.9	41.6	23.0
Difference	9.0	2.5	10.0
Traffic	15.1	34.3	18.6
No traffic	18.0	41.7	23.1
Difference	-2.9	7.4	4.5
Any Moral Waiver	23.4	45.2	29.5
No Moral Waiver	16.3	39.9	20.9
Difference	7.1	5.3	8.6

Summary. For the Navy accessions as a whole, those who received a moral waiver had a greater probability of being discharged for unsuitability than those who did not. This relationship was strongest for misdemeanor moral waivers. Mental category, race/ethnic group, gender, and education level are related to both moral waiver and unsuitability discharge status. While these variables have some moderating effect on the magnitude of the relationship between moral waiver and unsuitability attrition, the moderating effects are relatively small. In general, regardless of the level of the moderator variable, those with moral waivers have a greater probability of being discharged for unsuitability than those who do not.

Air Force

Table 41 shows the percentages and frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force accessions with moral waivers by waiver type. The "other" type included waivers for juvenile or adult felonies and preservice drug or alcohol use. Although several infrequently used waiver categories were collapsed into the "other" category, the number of such waivers is still small. Likewise the number of traffic waivers is small. Although the results for the "other" and the traffic waivers are presented in the tables, only the findings on misdemeanor waivers are discussed. Table 42 demonstrates that enlistees in the Air Force with misdemeanor waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those without. There is a difference of 7% between the two groups in the likelihood of receiving an unsuitability discharge.

AFQT. Table 43 shows the relationship between AFQT category and unsuitability discharge. Table 44 demonstrates the relationship between AFQT category and moral waiver status. Note that those in higher mental categories are less likely to receive unsuitability discharges but more likely to receive misdemeanor waivers. Table 45 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by AFQT category and moral waiver type. Table 46 shows the percent of unsuitability discharges by AFQT category and moral waiver status.

The results indicate that the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition is not a spurious one solely due to the correlation of AFQT with the waiver and attrition variables. When the percentages of unsuitability discharges are examined by AFQT category, they continue to show that enlistees with misdemeanor waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those without. The predictive strength of the misdemeanor waiver status is approximately the same for each AFQT category. Thus, unlike the Army and Navy data, AFQT has no clear moderating effect on the relationship between waiver status and unsuitability discharge.

Race/Ethnic Group. Whites receive a greater proportion of unsuitability discharges than Hispanics or Asians (see Table 47). Whites are also granted a greater proportion of moral waivers (see Table 48). The question posed by these data is whether moral waiver status is an accurate predictor of unsuitability or is the apparent relationship misleading due to the relationship of race with waiver and attrition status. Table 49 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by race/ethnic group and waiver type. Table 50 displays the percent of unsuitability discharges by race/ethnic group and moral waiver status. Very few waivers were granted to nonwhites; this makes any interpretation of these data unsatisfying. We do note that for all race/ethnic groups those with misdemeanor waivers have greater chances of receiving unsuitability discharges than others.

Table 41

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Waiver Type**

Waiver Type	Percent	Frequency
Misdemeanor	4.1	2,642
"Other"	.3	217
Traffic	.1	41
Any moral waiver	4.6	2,900
No moral waiver	95.5	60,905
Total	100.0	63,805

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 42

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status
for FY 1992 Air Force Accessions**

Waiver Type	Percent
Misdemeanor	27.1
No misdemeanor	20.1
Difference	7.0
"Other"	27.7
No "other"	20.4
Difference	7.3
Traffic	38.6
No traffic	20.4
Difference	18.2
Any Moral Waiver	27.3
No Moral Waiver	20.1
Difference	7.2

Table 43

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	5.9	23.9	23.0	21.9	18.2	12.9	20.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	1	918	3,644	3,448	4,736	284	13,031
Frequency of Total Accessions	17	3,846	15,874	15,772	26,094	2,202	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	--	6.0	24.9	24.7	40.9	3.5	100.0

Table 44

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Percent of Moral Waivers	17.7	3.7	4.2	4.4	4.9	4.7	4.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	3	143	669	697	1,285	103	2,900
Frequency of Total Accessions	17	3,846	15,874	15,772	26,094	2,202	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	--	6.0	24.9	24.7	40.9	3.5	100.0

Table 45

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions
with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type

Waiver Type	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups												Total	
	IV B		IV A		III B		III A		II		I		%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	17.7	3	3.6	139	3.9	617	4.0	629	4.5	1,161	4.2	93	4.1	2,642
'Other'	--	--	.1	2	.3	44	.4	58	.4	103	.5	10	.3	217
Traffic	--	--	.1	2	.1	8	.1	10	.1	21	--	--	.1	41
Any Moral Waiver	17.7	3	3.7	143	4.2	669	4.4	697	4.9	1,285	4.7	103	4.6	2,900
No Moral Waiver	82.4	14	96.3	3,703	95.8	15,205	95.6	15,075	95.1	24,809	95.3	2,099	95.5	60,905
Total	100.0	17	100.0	3,846	100.0	15,674	100.0	15,772	100.0	26,094	100.0	2,202	100.0	63,805

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 46

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						Total
	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	
Misdemeanor	33.3	30.9	30.0	29.1	25.0	19.4	27.1
No Misdemeanor	--	23.6	22.7	21.6	17.8	12.6	20.1
Difference	7.3	7.3	7.5	7.2	6.8	7.0	
'Other'	--	--	45.5	22.4	23.3	30.0	27.7
No 'Other'	5.9	23.9	22.8	21.9	16.1	12.8	20.4
Difference	--	--	0.5	5.2	17.2	7.3	
Traffic	--	100.0	37.5	40.0	28.6	--	36.8
No Traffic	5.9	23.8	23.0	21.9	18.1	12.9	20.4
Difference	--	76.2	14.5	18.1	10.5	--	16.2
Any Moral Waiver	33.3	31.5	30.6	28.7	24.9	20.4	27.3
No Moral Waiver	--	23.6	22.6	21.6	17.8	12.5	20.1
Difference	--	7.9	8.0	7.1	7.1	7.9	6.9

Table 47

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	20.0	23.6	17.4	10.6	20.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	10,309	2,367	300	55	13,031
Frequency of Total Accessions	51,519	10,042	1,727	517	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	80.7	15.7	2.7	.8	100.0

Table 48

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	5.0	2.9	3.0	2.3	4.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	2,550	286	52	12	2,900
Frequency of Total Accessions	51,519	10,042	1,727	517	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	80.7	15.7	2.7	.8	100.0

Table 49

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type**

Waiver Type	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	4.5	2,328	2.6	259	2.5	43	2.3	12	4.1	2,642
"Other"	.4	189	.2	23	.3	5	--	--	.3	217
Traffic	.1	33	--	4	.2	4	--	--	.1	41
Any Waiver	5.0	2,550	2.9	286	3.0	52	2.3	1	4.6	2,900
No Waiver	95.1	48,969	97.2	9,756	97.0	1,675	97.7	505	95.5	60,905
TOTAL	100.0	51,519	100.0	10,042	100.0	1,727	100.0	517	100.0	63,805

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 50

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Total
Misdemeanor	26.8	29.0	34.9	25.0	27.1
No Misdemeanor	19.7	23.4	16.9	10.3	20.1
Difference	7.1	5.6	18.0	14.7	7.0
"Other"	26.5	43.5	--	--	27.7
No "Other"	20.0	23.5	17.4	10.6	20.4
Difference	6.5	20.0	--	--	7.3
Traffic	39.4	25.0	25.0	--	36.6
No Traffic	20.0	23.6	17.4	10.6	20.4
Difference	19.4	1.4	7.6	-	16.2
Any Moral Waiver	26.9	30.1	30.8	25.0	27.3
No Moral Waiver	19.7	23.4	17.0	10.3	20.1
Difference	7.2	6.7	13.8	14.7	7.2

Gender Females have lower unsuitability attrition rates than males (see Table 51), and also receive fewer waivers (see Table 52). This raises the question of whether the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition is really due to gender differences.

Table 53 gives the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by gender and waiver type. Table 54 shows that the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition is not due to gender. Misdemeanor waiver status predicts unsuitability attrition for both sexes. Consistent with the Navy data, and in contrast to the Army data, gender shows little moderating effect on the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge.

Education. Enlistees who have not graduated from high school are separated from service with unsuitability discharges in much greater proportions than those who have completed high school (see Table 55). Nongraduates are also more likely than graduates to receive moral waivers (see Table 56). This analysis addresses the question of whether the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability is a spurious one caused by the correlation of education with the waiver and attrition measures.

Table 57 reveals the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by education level and waiver type. Table 58 shows that for both high school graduates and nongraduates, those who receive misdemeanor waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those who do not. However, consistent with both the Army and the Navy data, the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability attrition status is strongest for the high school graduates. This finding should be viewed as tentative, given the small number of nongraduates with waivers.

Summary. For the Air Force accessions, those who received a misdemeanor waiver had a greater probability of being discharged for unsuitability than those who did not. AFQT is not a compelling moderator of this relationship. For all race/ethnic, gender, and education groups, those who receive a misdemeanor waiver are more likely to receive an unsuitability discharge than those without. The small number of nonwhites and non-high school graduates makes it difficult to draw firm conclusion about race/ethnic or education moderators of the relationship. In contrast to the Army results and consistent with the findings for the Navy, the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge is not meaningfully moderated by gender.

Table 51**The Relationship Between Gender and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	21.3	14.5	20.4
Frequency of Unsuitability Discharges	11,861	1,170	13,031
Frequency of Total Accessions	55,708	8,097	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	87.3	12.7	100.0

Table 52**The Relationship Between Gender and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	5.0	1.8	4.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	2,755	145	2,900
Frequency of Total Accessions	55,708	8,097	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	87.3	12.7	100.0

Table 53

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Air Force Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type**

Waiver Type	Male		Female		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	4.5	2,508	1.7	134	4.1	2,642
"Other"	.4	207	.1	10	.3	217
Traffic	.1	40	--	1	.1	41
Any moral waiver	5.0	2,755	1.8	145	4.6	2,900
No moral waiver	95.1	52,953	98.2	7,952	95.5	60,905
Total	100.0	55,708	100.0	8,097	100.0	63,805

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 54

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges
by Gender and Moral Waiver Status for
FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	Male	Female	Total
Misdemeanor	27.5	20.2	27.1
No misdemeanor	21.0	14.4	20.1
Difference	6.5	5.8	7.0
"Other"	28.5	10.0	27.7
No "other"	21.3	14.5	20.4
Difference	7.2	-4.5	7.3
Traffic	37.5	--	36.6
No traffic	21.3	14.5	20.4
Difference	16.2	--	16.2
Any Moral Waiver	27.7	19.3	27.3
No Moral Waiver	21.0	14.4	20.1
Difference	6.7	4.9	7.2

Table 55

**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	High School Grads	Non-HS Grads	Total
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	19.4	38.7	20.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	11,701	1,330	13,031
Frequency of Total Accessions	60,369	3,436	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	94.6	5.4	100.0

Table 56

**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions**

	High School Grads	Non-HS Grads	Total
Percent of Moral Waivers	4.5	5.6	4.6
Frequency of Moral Waivers	2,709	191	2,900
Frequency of Total Accessions	60,369	3,436	63,805
Percent of Total Accessions	94.6	5.4	100.0

Table 57

Percentages and Frequencies of Force Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Education Level and Waiver Type

Waiver Type	High School Grads		Non-HS Grads		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Misdemeanor	4.1	2,472	5.0	170	4.1	2,642
"Other"	.3	202	.4	15	.3	217
Traffic	.1	35	.2	6	.1	41
Any moral waiver	4.5	2,709	5.6	191	4.6	2,900
No moral waiver	95.5	57,660	94.4	3,245	95.5	60,905
Total	100.0	60,369	100.0	3,436	100.0	63,805

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 58

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Air Force Accessions

	High School Grads	Non-HS Grads	Total
Misdemeanor	26.2	40.6	27.1
No misdemeanor	19.1	38.6	20.1
Difference	7.1	2.0	7.0
"Other"	27.2	33.3	27.7
No "other"	19.4	38.7	20.4
Difference	7.8	-5.4	7.3
Traffic	34.3	50.0	38.8
No traffic	19.4	38.7	20.4
Difference	14.9	11.3	16.2
Any Moral Waiver	26.4	40.3	27.3
No Moral Waiver	19.1	38.6	20.1
Difference	7.3	1.7	7.2

Marine Corps

Table 59 shows the percentages and frequencies of fiscal year 1982 Marine Corps accessions with moral waivers by waiver type. The "other" category type includes waivers for juvenile or adult felonies and preservice drug or alcohol abuse. The Marine Corps granted many traffic waivers. There were 13,166 enlistees, or 39.8% of all FY-82 Marine accessions, who were granted traffic waivers. Traffic waivers are granted in much greater numbers in the Marine Corps than in the other services because Marine Corps moral standards concerning minor traffic offenses are much more strict. (See page 3 of this paper for a description of the Marine Corps policy concerning the granting of traffic waivers and how it differs from the policies of the other services.) As seen in Table 60, traffic waivers do not predict unsuitability discharge, although misdemeanor and "other" waivers are related to unsuitability discharge. Accessions with misdemeanor waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges (30.2%) than those without misdemeanor waivers (23.7%). This represents a difference of 6.5%. Accessions with "other" waivers are also more likely to receive unsuitability discharges (29.1%) than those without "other" waivers (24.3%). This represents a difference of 4.8%.

The inordinate number of traffic waivers granted by the Marine Corps is also responsible for the anomaly in the data presented by Means (1983) and recreated in Table 1 of this paper. Of the 42 cells in Table 1 which show a statistically significant difference in the rates of unsuitability attrition by waiver status, only one cell shows a higher rate of unsuitability attrition for nonwaiver accessions than for accessions with waivers. This is the cell which shows the rate of unsuitability discharges for non-high school graduates who have received traffic waivers in the Marine Corps.

In the interest of consistency in the display of data throughout the services, the tables for the Marine Corps include the aggregate data on all waiver types and on traffic waivers. However, the analysis will only focus on misdemeanor and "other" waivers for the Marine Corps.

Table 59

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Waiver Type**

Waiver Type	Percent	Frequency
Traffic	39.8	13,166
Misdemeanor	10.0	3,295
"Other"	2.2	716
Any moral waiver	51.9	17,177
No moral waiver	48.1	15,943
Total	100.0	33,120

Table 60

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Moral Waiver Status
for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

Waiver Type	Percent
Traffic	22.7
No traffic	25.5
Difference	-2.8
Misdemeanor	30.2
No misdemeanor	23.7
Difference	6.5
"Other"	29.1
No "other"	24.3
Difference	4.8
Any Moral Waiver	24.4
No Moral Waiver	24.3
Difference	0.1

AFQT. Table 61 demonstrates the relationship between AFQT category and unsuitability discharge. Table 64 presents the relationship between AFQT category and moral waiver status. Note that those in higher mental categories are less likely to receive unsuitability discharges but more likely to receive moral waivers. Table 63 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by AFQT category and moral waiver type. Table 64 gives the percent of unsuitability discharges by AFQT category and moral waiver status.

The results indicate that the relationship between moral waiver status (i.e., misdemeanor and "other" waivers) and unsuitability is not a spurious one. When the percentages of unsuitability discharges are examined by AFQT category, they generally show that enlistees with these waivers are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those without these waivers. Consistent with Air Force, but in contrast with the Army and Navy, there is no clear moderating effect of AFQT group on the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge.

Race/Ethnic Group. Whites receive a greater proportion of unsuitability discharges than blacks, Hispanics, or Asians (see Table 65). Whites are also granted a greater proportion of moral waivers (see Table 66). The analyses address the issue of whether moral waiver status is an accurate predictor of unsuitability, or whether the apparent relationship is due to the correlations between race/ethnic group and the waiver and attrition variables.

Table 67 shows the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by race/ethnic group and waiver type. There are very few nontraffic waivers granted to blacks, Hispanics and Asians making the interpretation of their data uncertain. Table 68 shows that misdemeanor waiver status is a predictor of unsuitability within each racial group.

Gender. Females show lower attrition than males (see Table 69), and also receive fewer waivers (see Table 70). This analysis addresses the question of whether the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition is primarily due to gender differences.

Table 71 presents the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by gender and waiver type. The few number of nontraffic waivers granted to females makes the interpretation of the data in Table 72 troublesome.

Education. Enlistees who have not graduated from high school are separated from service with unsuitability discharges in much greater proportions than those who have completed a high school education (see Table 73). Non-high school graduates are more likely than graduates to receive moral waivers (see Table 74). This brings into question whether the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability is a

Table 61

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						<u>Total</u>
	<u>IV B</u>	<u>IV A</u>	<u>III B</u>	<u>III A</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>I</u>	
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	22.2	26.1	28.1	24.9	20.4	17.5	24.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	2	727	2,968	2,043	2,204	128	8,072
Frequency of Total Accessions	9	2,787	10,556	8,212	10,825	731	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	--	8.4	31.9	24.8	32.7	2.2	100.0

Table 62

**The Relationship between Mental Ability Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups						<u>Total</u>
	<u>IV B</u>	<u>IV A</u>	<u>III B</u>	<u>III A</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>I</u>	
Percent of Moral Waivers	77.8	42.7	47.8	51.2	57.8	64.7	51.9
Frequency of Moral Waivers	7	1,189	5,046	4,203	6,259	473	17,177
Frequency of Total Accessions	9	2,787	10,556	8,212	10,825	731	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	--	8.4	31.9	24.8	32.7	2.2	100.0

Table 63

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions
with Moral Waivers by AFQT Group and Moral Waiver Type

Waiver Type	AFQT (Mental Ability) Groups													
	IV B		IV A		III B		III A		II		I		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Traffic	55.6	5	33.3	926	35.8	3,762	36.6	3,171	45.4	4,912	50.3	368	39.8	13,166
Misdemeanor	22.2	2	8.2	229	9.9	1,040	10.4	953	10.1	1,091	10.9	80	10.0	3,295
'Other'	-	-	1.2	32	2.1	224	2.2	179	2.4	256	3.4	25	2.2	716
Any Moral Waiver	77.8	7	42.7	1,189	47.8	5,046	51.2	4,203	57.8	6,259	64.7	473	51.9	17,177
No Moral Waiver	22.2	2	57.3	1,596	52.2	5,510	48.8	4,009	42.2	4,566	35.3	258	48.1	15,943
Total	100.0	9	100.0	2,787	100.0	10,556	100.0	8,212	100.0	10,825	100.0	731	100.0	33,120

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 64

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by AFQT Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions

	IV B	IV A	III B	III A	II	I	Total
Traffic	20.0	27.1	25.8	23.2	19.7	15.8	22.7
No Traffic	25.0	25.6	29.4	26.0	20.9	19.3	25.5
Difference	-5.0	1.5	-3.6	-2.8	-1.2	-3.5	-2.8
Misdemeanor	50.0	25.8	35.4	29.9	26.9	25.0	30.2
No Misdemeanor	14.3	26.1	27.3	24.3	19.6	16.6	23.7
Difference	35.7	-0.3	8.1	5.6	7.3	8.4	7.2
"Other"	--	28.1	30.4	32.4	27.0	16.0	29.1
No "Other"	22.2	26.1	28.1	24.7	20.2	17.6	24.3
Difference	--	2.0	2.3	7.7	6.8	-1.06	4.8
Any Moral Waiver	28.6	26.8	28.0	24.9	21.2	17.3	24.4
No Moral Waiver	--	25.5	28.2	24.8	19.2	17.8	24.3
Difference	--	1.3	-0.2	0.1	2.0	-0.5	-0.3

Table 65

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuit- ability Discharges	24.3	25.9	19.8	14.7	24.4
Frequency of Unsuit- ability Discharges	6,301	1,508	243	20	8,072
Frequency of Total Accessions	25,933	5,821	1,230	136	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	78.3	17.6	3.7	.4	100.0

Table 66

**The Relationship between Race/Ethnic Group and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	57.2	30.3	43.3	43.4	51.9
Frequency of Moral Waivers	14,821	1,765	532	59	17,177
Frequency of Total Accessions	25,933	5,821	1,230	137	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	78.3	17.6	3.7	0.4	100.0

Table 67

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Race/Ethnic Group and Waiver Type

Waiver Type	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Traffic	43.7	11,322	24.1	1,403	31.8	391	36.8	50	39.8	13,166
Misdemeanor	11.1	2,870	5.3	310	9.0	111	2.9	4	10.0	3,295
"Other"	2.4	629	.9	52	2.4	30	3.7	5	2.2	716
Any Waiver	57.2	14,821	30.3	1,765	43.3	532	43.4	59	51.9	17,177
No Waiver	42.8	11,112	69.7	4,056	56.7	698	56.6	77	48.1	15,943
TOTAL	100.0	25,933	100.0	5,821	100.0	1,230	100.0	136	100.0	33,120

Table 68

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Race/Ethnic Group
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Total
Traffic	22.9	23.7	14.8	8.0	22.7
No Traffic	25.4	26.6	22.1	18.6	25.5
Difference	-2.5	-2.9	-7.3	-10.6	-2.8
Misdemeanor	29.0	40.3	33.3	25.0	30.2
No Misdemeanor	23.7	25.1	18.4	14.4	23.7
Difference	5.3	15.2	14.9	10.6	6.5
"Other"	29.4	28.9	26.7	--	29.1
No "Other"	24.2	25.9	19.6	15.3	24.3
Difference	5.2	3.0	7.1	--	4.8
Any Moral Waiver	24.4	28.8	19.4	8.5	24.4
No Moral Waiver	24.2	25.5	20.1	19.5	24.3
Difference	0.2	1.3	-0.7	-11.0	0.1

Table 69

**The Relationship Between Gender and Unsuitability Discharges
for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	24.6	21.3	24.4
Frequency of Unsuitability Discharges	7,660	412	8,072
Frequency of Total Accessions	31,186	1,934	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	94.2	5.8	100.0

Table 70

**The Relationship Between Gender and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	52.9	35.6	51.9
Frequency of Moral Waivers	16,489	688	17,177
Frequency of Total Accessions	31,186	1,934	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	94.2	5.8	100.0

Table 71

Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Gender and Waiver Type

Waiver Type	Male		Female		Total	
	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.
Traffic	40.2	12,546	32.1	620	39.8	13,166
Misdemeanor	10.4	3,242	2.7	53	10.0	3,295
"Other"	2.3	701	.8	15	2.2	716
Any moral waiver	52.9	16,489	35.6	688	51.9	17,177
No moral waiver	47.1	14,697	64.4	1,246	48.1	15,943
Total	100.0	31,186	100.0	1,934	100.0	33,120

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 72

Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Gender
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions

	Male	Female	Total
Traffic	22.9	19.4	22.7
No traffic	25.7	22.2	25.5
Difference	-2.8	-2.8	-2.8
Misdemeanor	30.3	24.5	30.2
No misdemeanor	23.9	21.2	23.7
Difference	6.4	3.3	6.5
"Other"	29.2	20.0	29.1
No "other"	24.5	21.3	24.3
Difference	4.7	1.3	4.8
Any Moral Waiver	24.6	22.2	24.4
No Moral Waiver	24.5	19.8	24.3
Difference	0.1	2.4	0.1

Table 73

**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Unsuitability Discharges for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Unsuitability Discharges	20.9	43.9	24.4
Frequency of Unsuitability Discharges	5,878	2,195	8,072
Frequency of Total Accessions	28,120	5,000	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	84.9	15.1	100.0

Table 74

**The Relationship Between Educational Level and
Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Percent of Moral Waivers	51.1	56.1	51.9
Frequency of Moral Waivers	14,372	2,806	17,177
Frequency of Total Accessions	28,120	5,000	33,120
Percent of Total Accessions	84.9	15.1	100.0

spurious one due to the relationship between education and the waiver and unsuitability variable.

Table 75 gives the percentages and frequencies of accessions with moral waivers by education level and waiver type. Table 76 shows that when the education variable is taken into consideration, misdemeanor waiver status continues to be a predictor for both high school graduates and nongraduates. "Other" waiver status, however, does not predict unsuitability for nongraduates. Consistent with the data from the other services, the relationship between waiver status and unsuitability discharge is strongest for high school graduates.

Summary. Relative to the other services, traffic waivers are granted in much greater numbers in the Marine Corps. This is because Marine Corps moral standards concerning minor traffic offenses are much more strict. Traffic waiver status is not strongly related to unsuitability discharge. For Marine Corps accessions as a whole, those who received a nontraffic moral waiver had a greater probability of being discharged for unsuitability than those who did not. This relationship was stronger for high school graduates than for non-high school graduates. The relationship between nontraffic waiver status and unsuitability discharge was not moderated by AFQT group, and the data for possible race/ethnic and gender moderators was too scant for a compelling evaluation.

Table 75

**Percentages and Frequencies of FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions
with Moral Waivers by Educational Level and Waiver Type**

<u>Waiver Type</u>	<u>High School Grads</u>		<u>Non-HS Grads</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Freq.</u>
Traffic	39.8	11,193	39.5	1,973	39.8	13,166
Misdemeanor	9.3	2,618	13.5	677	10.0	3,295
"Other"	2.0	561	3.1	155	2.2	716
Any moral waiver	51.1	14,372	56.1	2,805	51.9	17,177
No moral waiver	48.9	13,748	43.9	2,195	48.1	15,943
Total	100.0	28,120	100.0	5,000	100.0	33,120

Note: Percentages do not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 76

**Percent of Unsuitability Discharges by Educational Level
and Moral Waiver Status for FY 1982 Marine Corps Accessions**

	<u>High School Grads</u>	<u>Non-HS Grads</u>	<u>Total</u>
Traffic	19.4	41.3	22.7
No traffic	21.9	45.6	25.5
Difference	-2.5	-4.3	-2.8
Misdemeanor	26.1	46.4	30.2
No misdemeanor	20.4	43.5	23.7
Difference	5.7	2.9	6.5
"Other"	25.5	41.9	29.1
No "other"	20.8	43.9	24.3
Difference	4.7	02.0	4.8
Any Moral Waiver	20.9	42.6	24.4
No Moral Waiver	21.0	45.6	24.3
Difference	-0.1	-3.0	0.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study found that the accession groups which are more likely to receive moral waivers include men, whites, those in higher AFQT groups, and non-high school graduates.

Misdemeanor waivers comprise almost all waivers granted to Army and Air Force accessions, and are the most frequently given waiver in the Navy. Across all services, those who receive misdemeanor waivers are more likely than others to receive unsuitability discharges.

In the Navy, those who receive drug waivers and "other" waivers--which are granted in nontrivial frequencies--are more likely to receive an unsuitability discharge than those who do not receive such waivers. In the Marine Corps traffic waivers are the most frequently given waiver; however, these waivers are not related to unsuitability discharges.

Mental ability moderates the relationship between misdemeanor waivers and unsuitability discharge for both Army and Navy accessions. The difference in percents of unsuitability discharges between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without misdemeanor waivers is greatest for those in lower mental categories. In the Navy, this trend is also apparent in the drug and "other" waiver analyses.

For both Army and Navy accessions, the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge is greater for blacks than for whites. In the Navy, this trend is also apparent in the drug and "other" waiver analyses.

For Army accessions, gender moderates the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge. The difference in percent of unsuitability discharges between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without misdemeanor waivers is larger for males than females.

For accessions from all services, educational level moderates the relationship between misdemeanor waiver status and unsuitability discharge. The difference in percent of unsuitability discharges between those with misdemeanor waivers and those without misdemeanor waivers is greater for high school graduates than for non-high school graduates.

In summary, accessions who require moral waivers (excluding Marine Corps traffic waivers) for entrance to the military service are more likely to receive unsuitability discharges than those who have not received moral waivers. The predictive strength of moral waiver status, represented by a difference of approximately 6% in rates of unsuitability attrition, is robust enough to warrant serious consideration as a screening tool for each of the military branches.

Recommendation

The results of this study support the current Air Force policy, which makes prospective recruits with moral waivers ineligible for sensitive job assignments. The question remaining is whether other branches should develop a similar policy. Manpower constraints may make such a decision ill-advised without first conducting additional research.

Although the Army, Navy and Marine Corps do assign moral waiver recruits to sensitive jobs, this is done only after careful screening. Further research is needed to assess the current screening policies for moral waiver recruits for sensitive jobs. This could be achieved by analyzing the relationship between moral waiver status and unsuitability attrition for recruits in sensitive job assignments. The analyses could be carried out using the same approach implemented in this study. The comparison of unsuitability attrition rates will be a viable indicator of the effectiveness of screening procedures for waiver recruits in sensitive jobs. If the rates for waiver recruits are similar to those without waivers, the screening may be seen as effective (i.e., it reduces the probability of higher unsuitability rates for moral waiver recruits in sensitive jobs). If, however, the rates for waiver recruits are higher than those without waivers, then the screening has been ineffective (i.e., it has not reduced the rate of unsuitability for moral waiver recruits in sensitive jobs). See Wiskoff and Dunipace (in press) for such analyses.

The Marine Corps may wish to reevaluate its standards for granting traffic waivers. Those Marine Corps accessions who receive traffic waivers are not more likely than others to receive an unsuitability discharge.

References

- Crawford, K. S., & Trent, T. (1987). *Personnel security prescreening: An application of the Armed Services Application Profile (ASAP)* (PERSEREC TR-87-003). Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center.
- Crawford, K. S., & Wiskoff, M. F. (in press). *Screening enlisted accessions for sensitive military jobs* (PERSEREC TR-89-001). Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center.
- Defense Manpower Data Center. (1982). *Cohort File Format Sheet*. Monterey, CA: Author.
- Department of Defense. (1987). *Personnel security program regulation* (DOD 5200.2R). Washington, DC: Author.
- Flyer, E. S. (1985). *Analysis of background investigation information for FY 1974 - FY 1978 male non-prior service accessions*. Monterey, CA: Unpublished report to the Naval Postgraduate School.
- Flyer, E. S. (1986). *Personnel security research - prescreening and background investigation*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization International, Inc.
- Lang, D. A., & Abrahams, N. M. (1985). *Marine Corps Enlistment Standards: Trends and impact of waivers*. San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- McDaniel, M. A. (1988). *Personnel security prescreening: An application of the Educational and Biographical Information Survey (EBIS)* (PERSEREC TR-88-001). Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center.
- Means, B. (1983). *Moral standards for military enlistment: Screening procedures and impact*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization International, Inc.
- Wiskoff, M. F., & Dunipace, N. E. (1988). *Moral waivers and suitability for high security military jobs* (PERSEREC TR-88-011). Monterey, CA: Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center.